DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 357 206 CE 063 605

TITLE	Coordination of JTPA Programs, Vocational Education, and Technical Education.
INSTITUTION	South Carolina State Council on Vocational and Technical Education, Columbia.
PUB DATE	Mar 93
NOTE	30p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Agency Cooperation; *Coordination; Economically Disadvantaged; *Educational Cooperation; Educational Finance; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; *Job Training; Postsecondary Education; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Secondary Education; State Programs; Statewide Planning; Technical Education; Unemployment; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	Carl D Perkins Vocational Education Act 1984; Job Training Partnership Act 1982; *South Carolina

ABSTRACT

This biennial report provides an evaluation of the South Carolina vocational education program delivery system assisted under the Carl D. Perkins Act and the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). It focuses on the adequacy and effectiveness of the delivery system in achieving the purposes of the two acts. These findings of the State Council on Vocational and Technical Education are highlighted: more workshops were offered covering a number of topics related to JTPA programs; increased funding of JTPA programs could result in improved services and better qualified personnel; and paperwork required for participation in JTPA programs is too cumbersome. State council commendations and recommendations are then listed. Other sections describe the report format, data collection methodology, and the South Carolina JTPA delivery system. Tables and charts illustrate allocation of funds, expenditures, and program performance objectives and results for program years 1990 and 1991. The 10-question survey instrument is then provided. The following four sections contain the responses of these groups of respondents: state JTPA administrative unit, service delivery areas, secondary education (school district coordinators and vocational center directors), and technical colleges. A glossary of terms concludes the report. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED357206

COORDINATION

of

JTPA PROGRAMS
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

and

TECHNICAL EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

March, 1993

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R H White

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Prepared by

The South Carolina Council on
Vocational and Technical Education

2221 Devine St., Suite 420
Columbia, SC, 29205

Mr. Lonnie Rowell
Council Chairman

Dr. Robert H. White
Executive Director

CE063605

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COORDINATION
of
JTPA PROGRAMS
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
and
TECHNICAL EDUCATION

Prepared by

The South Carolina Council on
Vocational and Technical Education

2221 Devine St., Suite 420
Columbia, SC 29205
Tel: (803) 734-9161
Fax: (803) 734-9162

March, 1993

Mr. Lonnie Rowell
Council Chairman

Dr. Robert H. White
Executive Director

Mrs. Judith Warner
Committee Chair

Ms. Barbara Anderson
Executive Assistant

STATE COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mr. Lonnie Rowell
Private Sector
Summerville
Council Chairman

Mr. Lamar Brabham
Private Sector
Columbia

Mrs. Shirley Corbett
Post-Secondary Education
Florence

Mr. Gregory Guess
Private Sector
Aiken

Mrs. Deanne Jolly
Private Sector
Columbia

Mr. Frank Lanford
Secondary Education
Seneca

Mr. Frank M. Hart
Secondary Education
Marion
Council Vice-Chair

Mr. John A. Mahon
Private Sector
Cheraw

Mr. Larry Patrick
Private Sector
Bowman

Mrs. Eunice Spilliards
Sec. Educ./Special Needs
Ridgeland

Mr. James W. Tanner, Jr.
Post-Secondary Education
Johnsonville

Mrs. Judith V. Warner
Private Sector
Wagener

Dr. P.T. Williams
Post-Secondary Education
Sumter

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE ROLE OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA STATE COUNCIL 1

THE PURPOSE OF THE BIENNIAL REPORT 1

FINDINGS 2

COMMENDATIONS 2

RECOMMENDATIONS 3

THE 1993 REPORT FORMAT 4
- DATA COLLECTION METHODOLOGY 5
- RESPONSE RATE FOR EACH GROUP 5

THE JTPA DELIVERY SYSTEM 6
- SERVICE DELIVERY AREAS 8
- JTPA ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT 11

THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT 12
- STATE JTPA ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT RESPONSE 14
- SERVICE DELIVERY AREA RESPONSES 15
- SECONDARY EDUCATION RESPONSES 17
  - SCHOOL DISTRICT COORDINATORS 18
  - VOCATIONAL CENTER DIRECTORS 19
- TECHNICAL COLLEGES RESPONSES 20

GLOSSARY OF TERMS 23

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The South Carolina Council on Vocational and Technical Education wishes to acknowledge the cooperation and assistance given to them by the directors of the service delivery areas, the vocational coordinators and directors at the school districts and vocational centers, the state supported technical colleges, and the JTPA State Administrative Unit. The Committee appreciates the time and effort expended by the participants of these groups in gathering the data and participating in the survey for this report.

WHAT IS THE ROLE OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA STATE COUNCIL ?

The State Council on Vocational and Technical Education is a separate state agency mandated by the Carl D. Perkins Vocation Education Act of 1984 (reauthorized as the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, P.L. 101-392, September 25, 1990). The Perkins Act authorizes federal funds for vocational education, and each state must have a State Council, among other conditions, to be eligible to receive federal funds for vocational education. The Council does not operate any educational programs nor has any administrative authority over such programs. The Council does have, however, policy advice responsibilities for vocational education and technical education to groups such as the State Board of Education, the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education, and the Legislature. The Perkins Act requires a comprehensive report from each State Council every two years regarding the state's vocational education efforts.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE BIENNIAL REPORT ?

The real value of the biennial report lies in its evaluation of state vocational education program delivery systems assisted under the Act and under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), in terms of their adequacy and effectiveness in achieving the purposes of each of the two Acts. JTPA establishes programs to prepare youth and unskilled adults for entry into the labor force, and affords job training to those economically disadvantaged individuals and others facing serious barriers to employment. Additionally, the State Council compiles the biennial report to satisfy the requirement to "make recommendations to the State board on the adequacy and effectiveness of the coordination that takes place between vocational education and the Job Training Partnership Act."

Based on the data collected, the Council has the opportunity to make recommendations to the many State agencies and organizations involved in serving populations which include the unemployed, the underemployed, displaced workers, welfare recipients, the economically disadvantaged, and the handicapped.

The survey questions used to collect information for the 1993 Biennial Report focused on findings and recommendations made in the March 1991 Biennial Report. Questions were asked in order to follow up on whether or not any of the survey groups acted on the findings noted by the Council and whether or not any changes were implemented which improved the adequacy and effectiveness of the coordination that takes place between vocational education and Job Training Partnership Act programs.

FINDINGS

1. THE STATE COUNCIL DETERMINED THAT MORE WORKSHOPS WERE OFFERED COVERING A NUMBER OF TOPICS RELATED TO JTPA PROGRAMS.

2. THE STATE COUNCIL DETERMINED THAT INCREASED FUNDING OF JTPA PROGRAMS COULD RESULT IN BETTER PERFORMANCE STANDARDS, INCREASES IN STAFF NUMBERS, FOLLOW UP SERVICES FOR STUDENTS MOVING FROM SECONDARY TO POSTSECONDARY PROGRAMS, AND BETTER QUALIFIED PERSONNEL HIRED FOR JTPA PROGRAMS.

3. THE STATE COUNCIL DETERMINED THAT THE PAPERWORK REQUIRED FOR PARTICIPATION IN JTPA PROGRAMS IS TOO CUMBERSOME AND MAY DISCOURAGE SCHOOL DISTRICTS FROM INVOLVEMENT IN THESE PROGRAMS.

COMMENDATIONS

1. THE STATE COUNCIL DETERMINED THAT THERE WERE MORE FAVORABLE RESPONSES THAN NEGATIVE RESPONSES REGARDING COORDINATION ISSUES. ALL PARTICIPANTS ARE TO BE COMMENDED FOR THEIR INCREASED EFFORTS IN ACHIEVING COORDINATION BETWEEN THE JTPA SERVICE DELIVERY SYSTEMS.

2. THE SERVICE DELIVERY AREAS AND THE STATE ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT ARE TO BE COMMENDED FOR CONDUCTING MORE WORKSHOPS WHICH HELP TO EDUCATE SCHOOL PERSONNEL ABOUT JTPA PROGRAMS.

3. THE STATE ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT IS TO BE COMMENDED ON ITS WELL PLANNED, INFORMATIVE ANNUAL REPORTS.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THE STATE COUNCIL RECOMMENDS THAT THE PAPERWORK REQUIRED FOR PARTICIPATION IN JTPA PROGRAMS BE REDUCED OR STREAMLINED OR THAT FUNDING FOR TEMPORARY CLERICAL ASSISTANCE BE PROVIDED SO THAT THE PAPERWORK COULD BE ACCOMPLISHED BY SUPPORT STAFF.

2. THE STATE COUNCIL RECOMMENDS THAT THE SDAS AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION WORK TOGETHER TO IDENTIFY OR DEVELOP ACCEPTABLE FORMS OF PRE- AND POST- TESTS WHICH ADEQUATELY ASSESS PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS' ENTRY AND EXIT SKILLS.

3. THE STATE COUNCIL RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT WORK WITH THE SUPERINTENDENTS' ASSOCIATION AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION TO SCHEDULE JTPA TOPICS AS AGENDA ITEMS DURING THESE GROUPS' CONFERENCE MEETINGS. IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THIS SAME PROCEDURE BE USED WITH VOCATIONAL DIRECTORS AND SCHOOL DISTRICT COORDINATORS FOR JTPA PROGRAMS.

4. THE STATE COUNCIL RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE JTPA ADMINISTRATION ASSIST LOCAL SDAS IN IDENTIFYING AND PROVIDING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TEAMS TO FACILITATE THE DEVELOPMENT, SUBMISSION, AND ADMINISTRATION OF JTPA FUNDS IN LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

HOW WAS THE 1993 REPORT FORMAT DEVELOPED ?

The 1993 Biennial Report drew its findings and recommendations from responses to an assessment instrument tailored to South Carolina needs, issues, and concerns noted in the Findings and Recommendations Sections of the March 1991 Biennial Report. The Federal and State Requirements Committee, the group charged with the tasks of reviewing federal requirements, making recommendations for meeting the requirements, and participating in the preparation of reports or publications designed to meet the requirements, determined that the survey instrument for the 1993 report should assess whether or not any of the findings and recommendations noted in the 1991 report had been acted upon. Conducting a "follow up" on the previous report could provide data about what steps had been taken to enhance coordination among the surveyed groups. In addition, the Committee could receive feedback from the surveyed groups about whether or not specific improvements had been made in areas such as conducting JTPA informational workshops, developing basic skills assessment methods, or separating program performance reporting into more descriptive categories.

The Committee was aware that these surveyed groups are very often required to complete many reports, both State and Federal. With that in mind, the survey instrument was composed of only ten questions, with a place for each group to respond as appropriate. Inmost instances, the person completing the survey had only to check off his response. Question number ten allowed for any additional remarks to be made which had not been covered in the other nine questions. A cover memo explained the purpose of the survey instrument, how the data would be used, and the deadline for returning the instrument. In addition, participants were asked to review the 1991 Biennial Report to make themselves familiar with the Findings and Recommendations issued. The Committee used name and address labels generated by the State Department of Education to mail out the surveys to school district coordinators and vocational center directors.

The number of survey instruments returned for the first two of the groups was a reasonable rate, with a good return rate for technical colleges and the service delivery areas. The State Administrative Unit only required one survey instrument, giving it a 100 percent return rate. A follow-up letter was sent out to those not responding by the December 21, 1992 deadline, with telephone calls made to the technical colleges not responding by that date.

WHAT DATA COLLECTION METHODOLOGY WAS USED ?

After the Federal and State Requirements Committee members considered various topics and a number of different strategies for collecting data, they elected to develop a ten-question survey instrument based on the Findings and Recommendations Sections of the March 1991 Biennial Report. The Federal and State Requirements Committee reviewed the proposed questions and proposed survey groups and approved this mail survey approach for gathering the data. Four survey groups were identified, and each group received the same survey instrument.

1. All nine of the Service Delivery Areas (SDAs); it should be noted that two new SDAs have been added for program year 1992.
2. All South Carolina School District Vocational Coordinators and Vocational Center Directors (secondary education);
3. All South Carolina Technical Colleges (postsecondary).
4. The JTPA State Administrative Unit.

RESPONSE RATE FOR EACH GROUP

The following is a summary of the response rates for each group:

Survey Group	Number Possible	Number Returned
School District Coordinators	91	33
Vocational Center Directors	50	32
Service Delivery Areas	9	6
Technical Colleges	16	13
State Administrative Unit	1	1

THE JTPA DELIVERY SYSTEM

The Job Training Partnership Act program (JTPA) is a federal program which provides funds for job training. The South Carolina JTPA delivery system is responsible to the Governor. The Employment Security Commission was named by the Governor to be South Carolina's Grantee and administer the program. The Governor's Job Training Council sets policy and provide oversight. Private Industry Councils (PICs) make decisions concerning training for nine Service Delivery Areas (SDAs) in the state and contract with local technical colleges, community based organizations, and other training vendors.

Service Delivery Areas, or SDAs, are the districts within a state through which direct job training services are delivered. Each of the Service Delivery Areas in South Carolina has a Private Industry Council or PIC, which directs, interprets state policy directives, and manages the local JTPA system of activities and services in cooperation with other human service providers. The PIC shares overall policy and oversight responsibility for local programs with chief local elected officials. The PIC represents local business leaders who must make up a majority of its members. Whenever possible, half of that business majority should represent small businesses. Other PIC members represent education, organized labor, rehabilitation agencies, community-based organizations, economic development agencies and the local employment service.

Strong legislative mandates exist in both the Job Training Partnership Act and the 1984 version of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act, as well as the reauthorized Perkins Act, for coordination between education and job training providers. Such coordination efforts can increase efficiency and effectiveness of the service delivery system while decreasing duplication of services. The State Coordinating plan outlines coordination links with state agencies and organizations, and South Carolina's 1986 Employment Revitalization Act provides a framework for the development of memoranda of agreements between local technical colleges and secondary vocational education providers to coordinate services and articulate programs. In compliance with this legislation, South Carolina school districts have developed written agreements which outline coordination in the delivery of services in the areas of adult education, adult vocational education, and articulation.

During Program Years 1990 and 1991, the nine SDAs implemented Job Training Partnership Act policies set by the Governor's Job Training Council (GJTC) and interpreted by the Private Industry Councils (PICs). During Program Years 1990 and 1991, funds were allocated to the Governor for programs under the following titles:

Description PY 1990

Total Funds Available:		$36,612,708
Title II-A	Basic Grant for Adults & Youth	
a.	78% Adult & Youth Programs	$20,725,869
b.	8% State Education Coordination Grant	$1,834,597
c.	3% Older Individuals Training Program	$945,675
d.	6% Incentive and Technical Assistance	$1,645,067
e.	5% State Administration	$1,401,276
Title II-B	Summer Youth Employment and Training Program	$7,369,798
Title III	Dislocated Workers Program	$2,690,426

JTPA Funding Distribution for Program Year 1991 was:

Description PY 1991

Total Funds Available:		$38,133,751
Title II-A	Basic Grant for Adults & Youth	$21,223,888
a.	78% Adult & Youth Programs (Allocated to SDAs)	$15,724,595
	State-Administered Funds 22%	$5,499,293
b.	8% State Education Coordination Grant	$1,750,068
c.	3% Older Individuals Training Program	$908,923
d.	6% Incentive and Technical Assistance	$1,402,981
e.	5% State Administration	$1,437,321
Title II-B	Summer Youth Employment and Training Program	$12,441,740
Title III	Dislocated Workers Program	$4,468,123

SERVICE DELIVERY AREAS

PROGRAM YEAR 1990: ALLOCATIONS

	Total Allocations	78%	6%	3%	8%	II-B	Title III
Charleston	1,414,880	924,685	43,647	-	-	363,052	
Greenville	1,078,308	605,698	34,552	-	-	282,315	
Upper Savannah	2,122,691	1,259,488	65,513	-	-	579,138	
CSU	1,902,758	1,160,106	74,710	-	-	560,214	
Richland	1,047,920	625,494	39,869	-	-	284,636	
Pendleton	1,981,348	1,210,706	76,722	-	-	526,707	
Lower Savannah	3,143,490	1,964,471	92,127	-	-	849,086	
Pee Dee	4,162,814	2,618,825	122,815	-	-	1,108,279	
BOS	9,085,043	5,329,680	249,945	-	-	2,816,371	
State	9,272,180	5,026,716	845,167	945,675	1,834,597		
TOTAL	$35,211,432	20,725,869	1,645,067	945,675	1,834,597	7,369,758	2,690,426

*Refer to Page 7 for descriptive titles of funding percentages (columns) listed here.

PROGRAM YEAR 1991: ALLOCATIONS

	Total Allocations	78%	6%	3%	8 %	II-B	Title III
Charleston	1,768,404	836,622	46,982	-	-	570,051	
Greenville	1,271,422	611,537	34,846	-	-	455,718	
Upper Savannah	2,489,803	1,227,574	53,143	-	-	929,336	
CSU	2,384,305	1,122,048	69,549	-	-	1,058,060	
Richland	1,269,562	638,879	33,907	-	-	467,534	
Pendleton	2,494,942	1,065,671	61,561	-	-	1,154,228	
Lower Savannah	3,818,524	1,977,438	107,572	-	-	1,392,208	
Pee Dee	4,875,480	2,572,819	86,358	-	-	1,838,859	
BOS	11,452,176	5,672,007	302,653	-	-	4,575,746	
State	4,871,812		606,410	908,923	1,750,068	-	
TOTALS	$36,696,430	15,724,595	1,402,981	908,923	1,750,068	12,441,740	4,468,123

*Refer to Page 7 for descriptive titles of funding percentages (columns) listed here.

PROGRAM YEAR 1990: EXPENDITURES

	Total Expenditures	78%	6%	3%	8%	II-B	Title III
Charleston	1,062,966	812,845	43,647	-	-	349,024	
Greenville	989,778	547,765	34,552	-	-	264,058	
Upper Savannah	1,913,752	1,173,654	65,513	-	-	560,472	
CSU	1,807,484	1,118,234	74,710	-	-	505,107	
Richland	948,706	543,772	39,869	-	-	282,778	
Pendleton	1,931,110	1,208,444	76,722	-	-	496,977	
Lower Savannah	2,700,851	1,640,628	92,127	-	-	770,754	
Pee Dee	3,675,496	2,245,525	122,815	-	-	1,002,819	
BOS	8,783,252	5,270,027	249,945	-	-	2,727,798	
STATE	6,909,694	3,641,516	564,213	597,765	1,580,563	-	
TOTALS	$30,723,089	18,202,410	1,364,113	597,765	1,580,563	6,959,787	2,399,217

*Refer to Page 7 for descriptive titles of funding percentages (columns) listed here.

PROGRAM YEAR 1991: EXPENDITURES

	Total Expenditures	78%	6%	3%	8%	II-B	Title III
Charleston	1,659,514	747,695	46,982	-	-	563,028	
Greenville	1,040,604	524,732	34,846	-	-	325,633	
Upper Savannah	2,142,779	1,054,151	53,143	-	-	800,528	
CSU	2,127,059	1,031,830	69,549	-	-	908,875	
Richland	1,180,239	583,309	33,907	-	-	453,367	
Pendleton	2,188,777	955,026	61,561	-	-	968,666	
Lower Savannah	3,329,731	1,648,279	107,572	-	-	1,285,113	
Pee Dee	4,454,292	2,461,201	86,358	-	-	1,575,973	
Balance of State	9,927,679	4,802,112	302,653	-	-	4,090,043	
STATE	4,056,790	-	412,784	674,123	1,575,330	-	
TOTALS	$32,107,464	13,808,335	1,209,355	674,123	1,575,330	10,971,226	3,869,095

*Refer to Page 7 for descriptive titles of funding percentages (columns) listed here.

JTPA ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT

The Employment and Training Division of the Governor's Office served as the state administrative unit until May 2, 1990. The Governor then transferred administrative responsibility from the Governor's Office to the South Carolina Employment Security Commission (SCESC). The SCESC has continued to work for improved coordination among the many other state programs responsible for workforce preparation. The responses thus far from the other three survey groups indicate that significant progress has been made in establishing linkages among the groups involved in the state's employment and training system. But the positive strides made in coordination should continue to the point where all participants in the state's job training system work in concert to get the most mileage from the available resources, to reduce duplication of effort, and, most important, to serve the needs of those South Carolinians participating in the programs.

PY 1990 PROGRAM PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES AND RESULTS

July 1, 1990 through June 30, 1991
Title II-A Job Training Program

Item	Standard	Actual
Adults Employed on the 13th week after program separation	58.8%	58.5%
Welfare Adults Employed on the 13th week after program separation	46.8%	46.2%
Adult Weekly Earnings on the 13th week after program separation	$177.00	$210.00
Welfare Adults Weekly Earnings on the 13th week after program separation	$146.00	$167.00
Youth Entered Employment Rate	36.3%	44.0%
Youth Employability Enhancement Rate	29.5%	40.9%

PY 1991 PROGRAM PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES AND RESULTS

July 1, 1991 through June 30, 1992
Title II-A Job Training Program

Item	Standard	Actual
Adults Employed on the 13th week after program separation	54.14%	61.05%
Welfare Adults Employed on the 13th week after program separation	43.00%	49.87%
Adult Weekly Earnings on the 13th week after program separation	$180.00	$219.00
Welfare Adults Weekly Earnings on the 13th week after program separation	$153.00	$183.00
Youth Entered Employment Rate	29.49%	37.43%
Youth Employability Enhancement Rate	27.19%	36.81%

PY 1990 PROGRAM PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Title II-A	Youth	Adults
Total Indiv. Enrolled	5,248	5,526
Total Indiv. Ended JTPA Participation	3,074	4,085
Total Indiv. Who Entered Employment	1,233	2,574
Total Employed 13 Weeks after Program Separation	not reportable	2,520

Title III	Adults
Total Individuals Enrolled	4,243
Total Individuals Ended JTPA Participation	2,330
Total Individuals Who Entered Employment	1,547
Total Employed 13 Weeks After Program Separation	1,582

Total for Title II and Title III

Total Individuals Who Entered Employment	5,354
Individuals Enrolled	15,017

PY 1991 PROGRAM PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Title II-A	Youth	Adults
Total Indiv. Enrolled	5,510	5,593
Total Indiv. Ended JTPA Participation	3,052	3,892
Total Indiv. Who Entered Employment	1,147	2,390
Total Employed 13 Weeks After Program Separation	not reportable	2,510

Title II-B Summer Program Served 8,999 Enrollees.

Title III	Adults
Total Individuals Enrolled	5,645
Total Individuals Ended JTPA Participation	3,421
Total Individuals Who Entered Employment	2,541
Total Employed 13 Weeks After Program Separation	2,252

Total for Title II and Title III

Total Individuals Who Entered Employment	6,078
Individuals Enrolled	16,748

THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

The ten questions on the survey were:

1. In the March 1990 report on coordination between JTPA and vocational education programs at the secondary and post secondary level, the recommendation was made that there be designated and periodic formal orientation for school district coordinators, vocational center directors, and technical college JTPA coordinators regarding JTPA programs and preparation of grant applications. It was further recommended that workshops on the JTPA delivery system be in cooperation with the Office of Vocational Education (now the Office of Occupational Education) and the staff of the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education.

In order to determine if these recommendations have been acted upon, the State Council would like to know if such orientations and workshops have been held for these groups regarding JTPA programs and preparation of applications? Have you or staff attended any orientation sessions or workshops on JTPA programs during the past two program years (1990 and 1991)?

YES _____ NO _____

If yes, please identify how many during the past two program years (1990 and 1991), at what locations, and a brief summary of the topics covered. (Attach a list, if necessary.)

2. In the March 1990 report cited in Question 1, it was noted that local vocational/technical education personnel have a responsibility to know one or more designated JTPA staff persons who would provide direct assistance, when appropriate, in preparing proposals in response to GARs. In addition, as a matter of procedure, the GAR names a contact person who can provide additional information or answer questions prior to the closing date of the GAR/RFP.

Does your organization utilize one or more designated JTPA persons to provide assistance in preparing proposals in response to GARs/RFPs? If so, please identify this individual by name and title.

YES _____ NO _____

State Administrative Unit

If you receive calls from school districts coordinators, vocational center directors, and technical college JTPA coordinators regarding assistance with GARs/RFPs, is there a designated person at the State-level who is able to answer questions or make a referral to a local JTPA official?

YES _____ NO _____

3. It was reported in the March 1990 Coordination Report that only one SDA was able to provide complete assessment data on the math and reading skills levels for eligible youth served in Summer Youth Programs. Some SDAs stated in their responses to the Council's survey that they use BSAP and CTBS scores, although the legislation calls for an assessment of these skills. The Council's recommendation in this regard was that the state administrative unit, in cooperation with the individual SDAs, should take steps to determine the most feasible way to address the topic of assessing and documenting the reading and mathematics skills levels of eligible participants in JTPA programs.

Other than relying on CTBS and BSAP test scores, have the individual SDAs and the Administrative Units developed methods for assessing math and reading skills?

YES _____ NO _____

If yes, what methods and were any other groups involved in developing these methods?

4. Finding #5 in the March 1990 report noted that the state was able to achieve the standard in positive termination rate for youth for PY 1988. But the figures for individuals (youth) ending participation did not reflect how many ended as completers or how many abandoned the program. Based on this finding, the Council recommended that data on participants be separated into more descriptive categories to show the disposition of all program participants (enrollees), with particular attention to those who fail to complete programs and/or fail to enter employment.

Are the data on Program Performance separated into descriptive categories which show the disposition of all program participants, particularly those categorized as "individuals ending JTPA participation"?

YES _____ NO _____

5. Finding #6 of the 1990 Coordination Report notes that SDAs desired to be more involved in planning and policy-making activities, particularly with Perkins-funded activities.

Since the survey was completed in 1990, are SDAs being included more frequently in these activities? If not, what are the reasons as to why SDAs are not more involved in these activities?

6. Finding #5 of the 1990 Coordination Report stated that the responses received from the secondary education sector revealed a lack of basic knowledge about JTPA programs and the JTPA legislation itself.

In your estimation, has the secondary education sector experienced an increased or decreased understanding of JTPA programs since the survey was conducted in 1990? What factors have caused you to form this opinion?

INCREASED _____

DECREASED _____

7. Finding #8 of the Coordination Report explains that performance standards were viewed by the majority of the respondents as a positive force in influencing program outcomes and ensuring accountability on the part of service providers.

In your estimation, do these performance standards still serve as incentives to serve the more needy segments of the population (AFDC recipients, economically disadvantaged, school dropouts, academically disadvantaged, handicapped) or has the situation changed since the survey was conducted?

YES_____NO_____

If no, please briefly summarize your reasons.

_____.

8. All survey groups reported strengths in the Grant Application Request(GAR)-/Request for Proposal(RFP) process used by JTPA. Do you still agree that:

* the process fosters competitiveness and innovation among providers?

YES_____ NO_____

* the RFP/GAR has clear instructions and a well-structured format?

YES _____ NO _____

* the RFP/GAR process offers equal opportunity for all applicants?

YES _____ NO _____

9. Responses from the technical colleges regarding coordination between private industry councils, service delivery areas, vocational education and technical colleges revealed that key activities (joint planning, review of grant applications, cross representation on vocational advisory committees and private industry councils) were frequently perceived as being handled without significant coordination among the groups.

Is the level of coordination adequate, has coordination improved, or has coordination among these groups weakened since the March 1990 report was issued?

From your perspective, is the level of coordination adequate, has coordination improved, or has coordination among these groups weakened since the March 1990 report was issued?

ADEQUATE _____

IMPROVED _____

WEAKENED _____

10. Are there any other remarks or comments you wish to make regarding the effectiveness of South Carolina's JTPA delivery system, vocational education program delivery systems, or coordination among the groups involved in vocational education program delivery?

STATE JTPA ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT RESPONSE

Question 1: No. A grant offers conference or technical assistance workshop is held after the issuance of each grant application request (GAR) to answer questions and requests relative to the GAR. These are held by each SDA and by the state for state-administered programs requiring a GAR.

Question 2: Yes. Such questions are generally not received at the state level for GARs not issued by the state. When such questions are received by the state, they are referred to the SDA by SAU staff. For state-issued GARs, questions are answered by the contact person listed in the GAR. SDAs also list a contact person in GARs issued at that level.

Question 3: No. SDAs generally use the most recent BSAP and Stanford-8 edition test scores provided by the school districts and in some cases standardized tests such as the TABE is administered. The tests are selected in accordance with the Job Training Plan Instruction published by the state.

The JTPA Reform Amendments effective July 1, 1993 Section 205(c)(1)(A) and 204(c)(1)(B) provides that:

A. In General. Except as provided in subparagraph (B) the programs under this shall include an objective assessment of basic skills and supportive service needs of each participant...

B. Recent Assessment. A new assessment or a factor of such assessment, of a participant is not required if the program determines it is appropriate to use a recent assessment of the participant conducted pursuant to another education or training program (such as the JOBS program or a regular high school academic program).

Question 5: No. Perkins funds are administered by the State Department of Education, Office of Occupational Education. The State Administrative Unit has not participated in planning the use of these funds except to review the State Plan for Vocational and Technical Education. The SAU also receives copies of applicable grant request. There has also been other information exchanged between the two offices. In addition, there has been some discussion on holding a joint staff orientation on the Perkins-funded programs and JTPA-funded programs. Such orientation would include SDA staff and service providers.

Question 6: Increased. Increase in SDAs, thus the secondary education sector representative at the PIC level should provide specific and public awareness of JTPA programs.

Question 7: Yes.

Question 8: Yes to all sections.

Question 9: Improved.

Question 10: The level of coordination among other agencies, organizations and programs and JTPA can be greatly increased. Increasing the level of coordination and collaboration has been identified as a goal of the state during the current biennium.

SERVICE DELIVERY AREA RESPONSES

Each of the existing nine Service Delivery Areas received the same survey form based on the Findings and Recommendations in the March 1991 Biennial Report. Responses were to cover program years 1990 and 1991, with no data collected on the newly created SDAs for program year 1992. The following is a summary of the responses to the ten questions, with any additional remarks recorded by question number.

SERVICE DELIVERY AREAS

Question #1: 3 yes 3 no

Question #2: 4 yes 2 no

Question #3 [not asked of SDAs]

Question #4: 6 yes

Question #5: 3 yes 3 no

Question #6: 5 increased 1 no estimation

Question #7: 5 yes 1 no response

Question #8: 6 yes to all sections

Question #9: 5 improved 1 adequate

Question #10 Comments:

The designation of SDA status has improved coordination and it will continue to improve, as the PIC fully grasps its role; I believe these surveys should be tailored to each segment that you are requesting complete the survey. The surveys are always confusing with various acronyms, unless the survey is completed by a full time JTPA professional it is unlikely you will have an honest, thorough, and accurate response. I would suggest that in the future that the surveys be reviewed by full time JTPA staff from each segment. In addition, several findings in your March 1991 report could have been clarified had the appropriate person been asked to review your report. Lastly, most people responding to this survey receive numerous reports/reviews of JTPA programs. I was very lucky to find my copy. I'm sure most people who were asked to complete this survey could not find a copy of the report completed nearly 2 years ago. A copy of the report should have been forwarded with the questionnaire to ensure an understanding of the confusing questions that were asked; South Carolina does a fine job

Other remarks from SDAs listed according to question number:

#1: Have not attended or been invited to workshops sponsored by the Office of Voc. Ed. or State Tech Board; Two JTPA programs and preparation of grant applications.

#2: Limited assistance is provided by JTPA staff due to ethical/legal requirements of procurement.

#3: The recommendations of the report requires a duplication of effort since test scores from the school districts specify the reading and math levels of youth. Why would you not use the school district's results? Pre and post tests are used to determine the completion of objectives by students in remedial programs.

#4: The categories have always been there. They are just not listed as a national performance standard. The finding from the 1991 report was very misleading and uninformed regarding JTPA reporting requirements; Entered employment, received employability enhancement.

#5: Are not asked and do not know with whom to coordinate; not invited to participate.

#6: I feel those directly involved in JTPA programs from secondary education in our area have always understood the JTPA programs they operate. I think the results of your survey might show otherwise based on who completes the survey, how the questions are perceived and the clarity of the questions asked; SDA contractors are coordinating more with the secondary education sector than in years past. We are even being allowed to operate JTPA program during the school day; Through the PIC and initiation of meetings between secondary education and JTPA contractors at the SDA level.

#9: Technical colleges cannot legally review grant applications if they are applying for JTPA programs. This would be a serious violation of ethic rules and regulations.

SECONDARY EDUCATION RESPONSES
SCHOOL DISTRICT VOCATIONAL COORDINATORS AND VOCATIONAL CENTER DIRECTORS

In South Carolina, the term "vocational education" generally refers to the occupational preparation programs offered at the secondary level and under the jurisdiction of the State Board of Education, which also serves as the State Board for Vocational Education. South Carolina's vocational education system consists of both secondary vocational education programs and postsecondary technical college vocational education programs which serve as a training delivery system. Many skill training services are provided through the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), with the skill training actually produced in many instances by vocational-technical education institutions. Vocational education is a state and local function assisted by federal government to attain broad national goals as well as state-generated economic development objectives. JTPA is a federal program implemented by state and local governments with federal funds in accordance with federal regulations. The Perkins Act and JTPA programs parallel each other in their objectives to develop improved links to the private sector and service to individuals who have characteristics that limit their opportunities in the labor market.

The state has fifty-one (51) area vocational centers and two hundred thirty-three (233) secondary schools in ninety-one (91) districts. The State Department of Education's Annual Reports for Vocational Education list the following enrollment figures for secondary vocational education courses:

1989-1990 School Year	
Secondary Students Enrolled in Voc. Ed. Courses	108,481
Secondary Students Completing Voc. Ed. Programs	10,820
Estimated Cost Per Voc. Ed. Student Served	$4,189

1990-1991 School Year	
Secondary Students Enrolled in Voc. Ed. Courses	104,720
Secondary Students Completing Voc. Ed. Programs	9,522
Estimated Cost Per Voc. Ed. Student Served	$4,740

SCHOOL DISTRICT COORDINATORS

Number and types of responses:

Question #1:
3 no response 17 yes 13 no

Question #2:
4 no response 16 yes 14 no

Question #3:
5 no response 12 yes 16 no

Question #4:
6 no response 13 yes 11 no 3 N/A

Question #5:
10 no response 12 yes 10 no 1 u/k

Question #6:
7 no response 16 incr. 6 decr. 4 no change

Question #7:
7 no response 23 yes 3 no

Question #8:
8 no response 20 yes 5 no

Question #9:
3 no response 20 adequate 5 improved
1 weakened 1 no change 1 not applicable

Question #10 Responses:

Only real problem is the amount of paper required to deliver a summer program. Since the instructor has much to do to provide individual instruction, the additional deadline paperwork with grants makes it very questionable for a repeat application on our part.

Other remarks from School District Coordinators listed according to question number:

#1: Finance; Summer Challenge Program; State JTPA Conference; amendments and changes in programs, youth programs; reasons for termination have been expanded and are more descriptive; two workshops on program requirements.

#3: Employment Security Commission administers Jobs Corps Reading Test, math assessment is not provided; teacher made pre test/ post test; SDA provided pre and post test assessment forms to JTPA grantees. Students are given tests at certification; Job service will administer their adopted test for youth without scores, Since the most recent scores are utilized and CTBS is not administered, Stanford 8 or BSAP scores are used.

#4: JTPA participant termination report JTPA Participant Summer Activity Report, Section III, Conclusion; Termination reports require data related to reason for termination; We use the same forms as always.

#5: Lack of funds, lack of personnel; Require/mandate attendance of coordinators at post-summer program state meetings; Lack of data funds and lack of personnel.

#6: Principals seem to be more aware of programs; limited discussions with school district personnel and JTPA coordinator; Through cooperative effort of secondary and post secondary instructors along with workshops and technical assistance information; Responsiveness of PIC chairman to inquiries, local efforts to identify applicable JTPA activities; More info has become available; With all the other mandates, school districts have little time to

research these programs, Memos from the SDA are difficult to read because of the use of all capital letters; Have not been contacted by JTPA personnel; There is more information generated that explains and describes the various programs; Increased personal contact and communications; increased explanation of program; Knowledge from study seeking funds for special students' summer program; More information is available to the schools through personal contact, posters, newspaper articles. The increased awareness is possibly because we have been involved in JTPA programs for several years.

#7: Most performance standards encourage selecting participants who are more likely to succeed; A local test coordinator or guidance counselor will have conversion tables which translate scores into grade levels, thus answering the question, above or below 7th grade level in reading and/or math; Often the most academically disadvantaged are not served in order to positively terminate at least 85% of program participants.

#8: There is a problem with the fact that many students very much need Academic Remediation and fall close to the income requirement and have to be eliminated; RFP/GAR doesn't have clear instructions or a well-structured format nor does it offer equal opportunity for all applicants.

VOCATIONAL CENTER DIRECTORS

Question #1:
2 no response 17 yes 13 no

Question #2:
6 no response 15 yes 11 no

Question #3:
3 no response 6 yes 23 no

Question #4:
6 no response 10 yes 11 no 5 not applicable

Question #5:
6 no response 12 yes 12 no 2 unknown

Question #6:
7 no response 16 incr. 5 decr. 4 no change

Question #7:
9 no response 20 yes 2 no 1 unknown

Question #8:
9 no response 20 yes 2 no 1 unknown

Question #9:
4 no response 14 adeq. 7 impr. 5 weakn'd
2 no change

Question #10 Comments:

The PICs need to hear more from the actual people in the field that are carrying out the rules and regulations on a daily basis. They need to know what works and what doesn't;

Other remarks from Vocational Center Directors listed according to question number:

#1: I serve on local PIC, all programs were discussed that fell under JTPA funding; Summer Youth Program; Topics covered were eligibility requirements of participants, application processing, program administration requirements, curriculum requirements and fiscal accountability; Coordination Funding; 2 each year; one on how to fill out the grant application and one on accounting procedures.

#2: No comments.

#3: Assessment developed locally.

#4: Met program objectives, did not meet program objectives, attended less than 2 weeks of training and was found to be unsuited to this program activity, transferred to another grant in the same title; completers and non-completers; Entered employment full time or part time, refused to continue, entered non-JTPA training, return to school; Completers and terminators; On the end of the program report, we stated how many were terminated because of disciplinary actions, how many found another job, and how many refused to continue in the program.

#5: Lack of funds, lack of personnel; lack of funding; lack of data; lack of funds; lack of funds, lack of personnel; lack of personnel; lack of funds, lack of personnel; we have never been asked to be involved in any of this preparation or planning--we don't know what the reason is.

#6: I have not seen or heard of any information being given to our secondary education instructors; Lower Savannah Council of Governments has conducted workshops since 1990 with followup site visits after program start up, has assured understanding of JTPA operations by coordinators on a continuing basis; contacts are limited; lack of involvement; More information on JTPA mailed to secondary schools; information does not get to this level; lack of a full time JTPA person; Member of PIC; local participation; information about the programs are being distributed earlier in the year as compared to previous years.

#7: From a vocational center, it is difficult to identify potential recipients; Still, there is clearly a need to service those students who have not performed well on standardized tests with income above income guidelines.

#8: Too much paperwork, hard to read and understand at times; Instructions are okay but question other two items in this number.

#9: Lack of funding.

STATE SUPPORTED TECHNICAL COLLEGES RESPONSES

The postsecondary technical education (Tech) system is comprised of sixteen technical colleges, including at least three multi-campus colleges, that are strategically located throughout the state. The role of the Tech system was expanded in 1972 to include college-parallel programs awarding Associate of Arts or Science degrees, which are now offered at a number of the colleges. The Tech system typically serves more than 50,000 people in its certificate, diploma and associate degree programs. The technical colleges also serve many individuals in continuing education courses. In addition, there is a great amount of participation in community service (non-credit) short courses. The state-level board for policy, coordination and General Funds distribution is the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education (SBTCE).

Each of the sixteen technical colleges was mailed a survey; of the sixteen, thirteen technical college JTPA coordinators responded.

TECHNICAL COLLEGES

Question #1:	11 yes	2 no	
Question #2:	10 yes	2 no	1 no response
Question #3:	4 yes	9 no	

Question #4:	11 yes	1 no	1 no response
Question #5:	3 yes	10 no	
Question #6:	8 incr.	2 same	3 no response
Question #7:	8 yes	3 no	2 no response
Question #8:	11 yes to all		1 no 1 no response
Question #9:	4 improved 2 weakened		3 adequate 1 no change 3 no response

Question #10 Comments: None

Other remarks from Technical College Respondents listed according to question number:

#1. Other than the annual state JTPA conferences and local SDA meetings, no formal state-wide orientations or workshops have been held to my knowledge; State Conference; JTPA Amendments; JTPA Participant Data Systems; Job Development; Quality Control; Youth Competency; Client Selection; Teamwork; Participant Assessment Instruments; JTPA Amendments.

#2: All JTPA staff members are utilized to provide assistance in preparing proposals, JTPA Coordinator, Job Developer and Administrative Assistance; I am not aware of a designated person who is available to assist in preparing proposals.

#3: We only deal with adult JTPA participants; We have not been involved in summer youth programs to my knowledge.

#4: Adult/Youth Employability Enhancement, Adult Youth Competency Attainment; Enhancement Categories, Youth Competency attainment checklist categories; We only deal with adults, all program participants upon completion much meet prescribed competencies and enter employment; Enrollment characteristics such as minorities, youth AFDC, females, youth dropouts, handicapped, veterans, offenders and older individuals; No category has been added but this info is reported on MIS 2 and 3; We are limited to the items listed on the MIS-3 termination report (i.e. contract transfer, entered non-JTPA training, health/pregnancy/family care, moved from area/cannot locate, refused to continue, other).

#5: No basis for responding to this question; no information is made available to College JTPA personnel on the SDAs involvement or activities with the Personnel responsible for Perkins funds; Catawba SDA is a new service delivery area as of July 1, 1992; Unaware of any effect of Carl Perkins administrative unit to involve JTPA, SDA, in planning and policymaking; I am uncertain as to the reason our SDA has not been involved; however, the college has always coordinated services between JTPA and Carl D. Perkins funding.

#6: There has been no effort which I am aware of that could have caused an increase or decrease in "Secondary Education" understanding of programs; Periodic recruiting and referrals from high schools and career centers; I would say decreased, but again I don't know what they received; Assumption that all low income people are eligible has increased referrals from high schools, plus Tech Prep programs and Tech College recruiting has informed schools of JTPA; Secondary Personnel are members of the local PIC and receive monies to provide services as local contractors; There is an increased awareness of more technical education programs and available services; I do not have any basis for opinion on this; This is to the targeting efforts made by the JTPA staff and admissions staff through personal contacts, brochures, and other liaison with Guidance Counselors at the four county area high schools; Although our college has limited dealings with the high

schools in relation to JTPA, we have worked more closely with their adult education programs in referring participants and in recruiting youth, particularly dropouts.

#7: No, because the needy population tends to have less motivation and commitment to complete training programs; Unable to answer; Performance standards are unrealistic in terms of clients we serve; standards are unrealistically high however the incentive monies make the risk more palatable; As more emphasis is placed on program outcomes which affect funding, it is more difficult to serve these populations as they negatively impact program performance (i.e. completion rates, entered employment rates, hourly wages and, especially, follow-up standards.)

#9: No JTPA coordinator.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

CBO: Community Based Organizations are private, non-profit groups within communities which are providers of programs or services.

COG: Council of Government.

EDWAA: The primary purposes of the Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Act are to establish an early readjustment capacity for workers and firms in each State; to provide comprehensive coverage to workers regardless of the cause of dislocation; to provide early referral from the unemployment insurance system to adjustment services as an integral part of the adjustment process; to emphasize retraining and reemployment services rather than income support; and to create an on-going substate capacity to deliver adjustment services.

GAR or RFP: Grant Application Request is the document sent out to the Service Delivery Areas within the state soliciting applications or proposals to provide employment and training activities and services under the Job Training Partnership Act. GAR is synonymous with RFP, or request for proposals.

GJTC: The Governor's Job Training Council plans, coordinates, and monitors state employment and training programs and services, but cannot operate programs or provide direct services.

JTPA: The Job Training Partnership Act establishes programs to prepare youth and unskilled adults for entry into the labor force and to afford job training to those economically disadvantaged individuals and other individuals facing serious barriers to employment, who are in special need of such training to obtain productive employment.

LEA: A Local Educational Agency is normally the school district, but it can be an educational agency which is eligible to receive Federal funds.

NASCOVE: The National Association of State Councils on Vocational Education.

PIC: The Private Industry Council shares overall policy and oversight responsibility for local JTPA programs with chief local elected officials. The PIC represents local business leaders who must make up a majority of its members. Other PIC members represent education, organized labor, rehabilitation agencies, community based organizations, economic development agencies and the local employment service.

SBTCE: State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education is the state-level board for policy, coordination and General Funds distribution for technical education provided by the technical colleges.

SCESC: South Carolina Employment Security Commission is the state agency responsible for administering JTPA.

SDA: Service Delivery Areas are the districts within a state through which direct job training services are delivered. Each SDA has a private industry council (PIC), and states must provide 78 percent of their allocations to SDAs.

1100 copies of this report were printed
at a cost of $1.00 per copy.
The total printing cost was $1,106.